

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 106 OF 2005

Patil Shantappa Sidramappa ..Applicant.
V/s.

The State of Maharashtra .. Respondent.

Shri P.R. Arjunwadkar for the Applicant.
Shri R.Y. Mirza, APP for Respondent - State.

CORAM : A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.
DATED : FEBRUARY 07, 2005.

PC :-

. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
Perused the record. 2. Even accepting the prosecution case as it is, there is no legal evidence to indicate complicity of the applicant in the commission of offence. The learned APP did rely on the fact that name of the applicant became aware after the arrest of the co-accused. However, the fact remains that no identification parade has been held after the arrest of the applicant. The co-accused were arrested on the spot. So far as the applicant is concerned, no identification parade has been held and there is no legal evidence to connect the applicant with the alleged offence. Besides, the investigation is complete and the chargesheet has been filed. There are no antecedents against the applicant. The

applicant has deep roots in the society. Accordingly, the Applicant is granted bail on the following conditions:-

(a) The Applicant is granted bail in connection with C.R.No.I-216/2004, registered with Foujadar Chavadi Police Station, Solapur on executing personal bonds in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- (Rs. Twenty-five thousand only) with two local sureties in the like amount.

(b) The Applicant shall not leave jurisdiction of the concerned police station without prior intimation to the investigating officer as well as trial court.

(c) The Applicant shall co-operate for early disposal of the trial. If the trial court is of the opinion that the applicant is responsible for delay in trial that fact be recorded in the Rozanama, which can be a ground for cancellation of bail.

(d) The Applicant shall not influence the prosecution witness or tamper with the prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

3. Ordered accordingly.

.....